



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,862	10/30/2003	Jingrong Cao	VPI/02-115 US	8080
27916 7590 05/23/2007 VERTEX PHARMACEUTICALS INC. 130 WAVERLY STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139-4242			EXAMINER BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
			ART UNIT 1624	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/23/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/696,862

Applicant(s)

CAO ET AL.

Examiner

Venkataraman Balasubramanian

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/23/2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-6, 8-12, 14-20, 23-46 and 54-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23-27, 30, 32, 34-36 and 46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 9-12, 15, 17, 19, 28, 29, 31, 33, 37-45 and 54-56 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicants' response, which included cancellation of claims 2, 3, 7, 13, 21, 22 and amendment to claims 1, 4-6, 8, 14, 16, 20 and 45, filed on 2/23/2007, is made of record. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-12, 14-20, 23-46 and 54-56 are now pending. In view of applicants' response, all claim objections, 102 and 103 rejections made in the previous office action have been obviated. However, upon further consideration, the following objections and rejections are applied.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 is an improper dependent claim as it fails to further limit claim 1 on which it is dependent. As recited the scope of claim 6 is broader than claim 1. Note Q1 in claim 6 includes SO<sub>2</sub>NHR, which is outside the scope of claim 1.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 1624

Claims 1, 4, 6, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23-27, 30, 32, 34-36 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al., US 2004014740.

Lee et al., teaches several thiophene compounds useful as anthelmintics and insecticides, which include instant compound and composition. See page 1, formula I and note the definition of R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6 and R7. Note when one of R1 or R2 is pyridyl and the other hydrogen or alkyl and R4 and R5 form a heterocyclic ring, the compounds taught by Lee et al., include instant compounds. See entire document including pages 6-22 for various examples of compounds made. Especially see page 11, example 11. Also see pages 19 and 20 compounds r and v.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 1624

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 4, 6, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23-27, 30, 32, 34-36 and 46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al., US 2004014740.

Teachings of Lee et al., as discussed in the above 102 rejection is incorporated herein. As noted above, Lee et al., teaches several thiophene compounds useful as anthelmintics and insecticides, which include instant compound and composition. See page 1, formula I and note the definition of R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6 and R7. Note when one of R1 or R2 is pyridyl and the other hydrogen or alkyl and R4 and R5 form a heterocyclic ring, the compounds taught by Lee et al., include instant compounds. See entire document including pages 6-22 for various examples of compounds made. Especially see page 11, example 11. Also see pages 19 and 20 compounds r and v.

Lee et al., differs from the instant claims in not exemplifying all compounds generically embraced in formula I with various R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6 and R7 substituents.

However, Lee et al. teaches equivalency of those compounds taught in page 6-22 with those generically recited in pages 1-6.

Art Unit: 1624

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make compounds using the teachings of Lee et al., including compounds with various R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6 and R7 substituents and expect resulting compounds to possess the uses taught by the art in view of the equivalency teaching outline above.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 5, 9-12, 15, 17, 19, 28, 29, 31, 33, 37-45 and 54-56 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable barring finding of any prior art in a subsequent search if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status

Art Unit: 1624

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

*Venkataraman Balasubramanian*  
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

5/18/2007